



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE

United States Patent and Trademark Office

Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS

P.O. Box 1450

Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450

www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/661,326	09/12/2003	David A. Cook	062891.1141	9358
5073	7590	06/02/2009		
BAKER BOTTS L.L.P. 2001 ROSS AVENUE SUITE 600 DALLAS, TX 75201-2980			EXAMINER O'CONNOR, BRIAN T	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2419	
			NOTIFICATION DATE	DELIVERY MODE
			06/02/2009	ELECTRONIC

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Notice of the Office communication was sent electronically on above-indicated "Notification Date" to the following e-mail address(es):

ptomail1@bakerbotts.com
glenda.orrantia@bakerbotts.com

Interview Summary

Application No.

10/661,326

Applicant(s)

COOK ET AL.

Examiner

Brian O'Connor

Art Unit

2419

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Brian O'Connor (Patent Examiner).

(3) Tim Gerlach (Reg No 57,548; for Applicant).

(2) Keiko Ichibe (Reg No 45,460; for Applicant).

(4) _____.

Date of Interview: 26 May 2009.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference
c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.
If Yes, brief description: _____.

Claim(s) discussed: 1.

Identification of prior art discussed: Visser.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☒ was not reached. h) ☐ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: Differences between the features in claims 1, 7, 12, and 17 and the disclosure of Visser were discussed. The Examiner would re-consider the teachings of Visser compared to claims 1, 7, 12, and 17; and perform an updated search for any further prior art. No consensus was reached during the interview.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Brian T. O'Connor/ May 26, 2009

/DANG T TON/
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2419